

**PATENT APPLICATION**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of

Docket No: A7736

Frank AMONG, et al.

Appln. No.: 10/031,405

Group Art Unit: 3628

Confirmation No.: 2070

Examiner: Igor N. BORISSOV

Filed: January 18, 2002

For: METHODS AND APPARATUS FOR MANAGING A TOUR PRODUCT PURCHASE

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION AND ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENTS**

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This responds to the Restriction and Election of Species Requirement, dated October 19, 2007. In response to the Restriction Requirement, Applicant elects **Group A**, claims 1-13, 23, 71-88, 152-158, 164 and 165 for examination. This election is made with traverse.

In particular, Applicant respectfully traverses this Restriction Requirement at least in view of the following comments. The Examiner has already examined and searched all of these claims (Group A and B) in a number of previous Office Actions. In the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 filed August 8, 2007, claims 89-139 were amended for improved conformity with the US practice and for further clarification and did not cause this Restriction Requirement. Since the Examiner already examined and searched all of these claims in multiple previous Office Actions, no serious burden exists. That is, there is no serious burden on the Examiner to

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION AND ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENTS

Attorney Docket No.: A7736

U.S. Application No.: 10/031,405

examine these claims together as has been done in the multiple previous Office Actions, see e.g. MPEP § 808.02. In fact, same prior art was used to previously reject all of these claims *i.e.*, claims in Group A and claims in Group B. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this Restriction Requirement.

In response to the Election of Species Requirement, dated October 19, 2007. The Examiner has identified the application as containing claims directed to more than one distinct species. The Examiner has required the Applicant to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted. The Examiner believes there are no generic claims. Applicant has been advised that a response to this requirement shall include an identification of the species that is elected and a listing of all claims readable thereon.

In response to the Examiner's requirement, Applicant elects **Species I**, for examination on which claims 1-7, 10-13, 71-79, 82-88, 152-158 and 165 are readable.<sup>1</sup> Applicant respectfully submits that at least claim 1 is generic to both Species.

Applicant submits that if any of the elected claims is found to be allowable, claims dependent therefrom (at least Species II) should similarly be considered allowable in the same application.

Applicant reserves the right to file a Divisional Application directed to non-elected claims 89-139.

---

<sup>1</sup> Claim 23 has been canceled in the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114.

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION AND ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENTS

Attorney Docket No.: A7736

U.S. Application No.: 10/031,405

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nataliya Dvorson/

Nataliya Dvorson

Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 19, 2008